23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2	*E-FILED: April 17, 2013*	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	NOT FOR CITATION	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11	AFS INVESTMENT GROUP, LLC; 1 TO INFINITY, LLC dba 1 TO INFINITY DB	No. C13-01726 HRL
12	PLAN,	ORDER THAT CASE BE REASSIGNED TO A DISTRICT JUDGE
13	Plaintiffs, v.	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION RE
14	MAXIMO F. ESTEBAR JR; and DOES 1 to 20,	REMAND TO STATE COURT
15	inclusive,	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	Defendant Maximo F. Estebar, Jr. removed this unlawful detainer action from the Santa	
19	Clara County Superior Court. For the reasons stated below, the undersigned recommends that	
20	this matter be remanded.	
21	Removal to federal court is proper where the federal court would have original subject	
22	matter jurisdiction over the complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1441. The removal statutes are strictly	

construed against removal and place the burden on the defendant to demonstrate that removal was proper. Moore-Thomas v. Alaska Airlines, Inc., 553 F.3d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing Gaus v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992)). Additionally, the court has a continuing duty to determine whether it has subject matter jurisdiction. FED. R. CIV. P. 12(h). A case must be remanded to the state court if it appears at any time before final judgment that the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

Defendant fails to show that diversity jurisdiction exists. Federal district courts have jurisdiction over civil actions in which the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000 (exclusive of interest and costs) and is between citizens of different states. 28 U.S.C. \$1332. The complaint indicates that the amount demanded does not exceed \$10,000. Moreover, defendant says that he is a California resident. (Notice of Removal ¶ 6). As a California defendant, Estebar cannot remove an action on the basis of diversity. 28 U.S.C. \$ 1441(b)(2) (an action may not be removed "if any of the parties in interest properly joined and served as defendants is a citizen of the State in which such action is brought."); see also Spencer v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 393 F.3d 867, 870 (9th Cir. 2004) ("It is thus clear that the presence of a local defendant at the time removal is sought bars removal.").

Although Estebar does not assert federal question jurisdiction, there is no basis for it in any event. Federal courts have original jurisdiction over civil actions "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. A claim "arises under" federal law if, based on the "well-pleaded complaint rule," the plaintiff alleges a federal claim for relief. Vaden v. Discovery Bank, 129 S. Ct. 1262, 1272 (2009). Defenses and counterclaims asserting a federal question do not satisfy this requirement. Id. Here, plaintiffs' complaint presents claims arising only under state law. It does not allege any federal claims whatsoever. Allegations in a removal notice or in a response to the complaint cannot provide this court with federal question jurisdiction.

Because the parties have yet to consent to the undersigned's jurisdiction, this court ORDERS the Clerk of the Court to reassign this case to a District Judge. The undersigned further RECOMMENDS that the newly assigned judge remand the case to the Santa Clara County Superior Court. Any party may serve and file objections to this Report and Recommendation within fourteen days after being served. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72.

1.72.

Dated: April 17, 2013

HOVARD RALEOYD INITED STATES MAGISTRATE HIDGE

Case 3:13-cv-01726-JST Document 6 Filed 04/17/13 Page 3 of 3

1	5:13-cv-01726-HRL Notice has been electronically mailed to:	
2	Kirkman Jan Hoffman kirk@kirkhoffman.com	
3		
4	5:13-cv-01726-HRL Notice sent on April 17, 2013 by U.S. Mail to:	
5	Maximo F. Estebar, Jr. 3451 Gila Drive	
6	San Jose, CA 95148	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		